

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/755,009	WOOD, WILLIAM A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James P. Hughes	2883

All Participants:

(1) James P. Hughes.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Svetlana Short.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 August 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Qi et al. (2003/0142940)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 Frank G. Font
 Supervisory Patent Examiner
 Technology Center 2800

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the interest of compact prosecution; applicant's representative, Svetlana Short, was contacted regarding the Qi teaching reference. The 2003/0142940 reference would be available for use in a 103(c) rejection; however, as there is a common assignee and a common inventor, applicant could overcome the reference with a statement that the Qi invention was commonly owned - at the time of the invention - and the instant applicant, Wood, was an inventor of the relevant teachings - e.g. that reducing the outer cladding diameter of less than 90 microns is advantageous because it will reduce the size, weight, and cost of a coiled fiber device suitable for dispersion compensation. See MPEP 706.02(1).

Svetlana Short verbally made the statement in an interview on August 19, 2005. During the interview it was agreed upon that applicant would respond to a Notice of Allowance with the statement in writing. Applicant is required to place the written statement on record..